

### REMARKS

Applicant has carefully reviewed and considered the Office Action mailed on August 15, 2006, and the references cited therewith.

Claims 1, 4, 16, 19, 22 and 25 are amended, claims 3, 18 and 24 are canceled; as a result, claims 1, 2, 4-17, 19-23 and 25-48 are now pending in this application.

No new matter has been added to the subject application as a result of the changes made thereto.

Turning to the rejections on the art, claims 1-48 stand rejected under 35 USC § 103 as being unpatentable over Brooks et al. in view of Witt. Applicants respectfully submit this rejection is in error.

Before addressing the Examiner's art rejection in detail, claims 1, 16 and 22 have been amended to require that a match is computed by cumulatively multiplying a predetermined value by each skill level for which the call has a corresponding skill requirement. Support for this amendment can be found, for example at page 9, paragraphs 0041-0046 and Table 2 found at paragraph 0043.

The examiner points to Brooks et al. as teaching "computing and match rating for each agent based at least in part on the at least one skill requirement associated with the call..." (Page 2, Official Action). However, it is Applicant's understanding of the Brooks et al. reference that Brooks teaches "The call handling needs are identified in a skill expression that is formed for each call. Preferably, the call-handling needs are linked by logical operatives "AND," "OR" and "NOT." The logical operative "AND" permits multiple call handling needs to be utilized collectively and simultaneously to select and ACD agent." (Brooks et al., column 5, lines 9-17)

However, as noted above, independent claims 1, 16 and 22 require that the match computation is done by cumulatively multiplying predetermined value by each skill level for which the call has a corresponding skill requirement. These teachings are nowhere disclosed or suggested in the Brooks et al. reference. Moreover, as noted in Table 2 found at paragraph 0043 of the present disclosure, a skill level may be assigned to a particular agent that takes on a numeric value relative to the skill level of other agents. Thus, by multiplying multiple criteria together, a more accurate result is obtained, and calls may be handled in a more efficient manner as opposed to the teachings of Brooks et al.

Thus, it is respectfully submitted that Applicant's invention of independent claims 1, 16 and 22, and all dependent claims thereon, define over the Brooks et al. reference.

It is noted that the Examiner has combined Brooks et al. with Witt to render obvious the claimed subject matter. It should be noted that Witt has a filing date of June 4, 2002. The filing date of the present application is March 5, 2002. Thus, the Examiner cannot properly rely on Witt in combination with Brooks et al. Accordingly, no specific discussion of the Examiner's art rejection of Brooks et al. in combination with Witt, especially in regard to claims 28-48, is believed necessary.

Having dealt with all the objections raised by the Examiner, it is respectfully submitted that the present application, as amended, is in condition for allowance. Thus, early allowance is earnestly solicited.

If the Examiner desires personal contact for further disposition of this case, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned Attorney at 603.668.6560.

In the event there are any fees due, please charge them to our Deposit Account No. 50-2121.

Respectfully submitted,

MICHAEL STANFORD

By his Representatives,

**Customer Number: 45459**

603-668-6560

By /Edmund P. Pfleger/  
Edmund P. Pfleger  
Reg. No. 41,252